EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Education Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 3, 1958

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, last Saturday my distinguished colleague from Montana's First Congressional District, the Honorable LEE METCALF, closeted himself in his office and typed out his thoughts on education legislation. On Monday he delivered his speech before the convention of the National Education Association in Cleveland.

I believe his is one of the most excellent statements on the subject I have ever read.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Representative METCALF'S speech printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Few people would envy my assignment today. It is hard enough to address any audience. It is frightening—even to a politician—to address an audience composed of some of the best public speakers in America, and to discuss the problems of education with a group which is better informed about those problems than any other group anywhere.

But I shall try to carry out my assignment and I'm not frightened by all these teachers. Perhaps I am fortunate that I have never had a teacher who frightened me. Perhaps some of my colleagues were not so fortunate and today they are venting their spleen on public education because some classroom ogre scared them in their more tender years. At least that is the only reason I can think of for some of the opposition to educational programs in Congress.

I welcome this opportunity to meet with you, first to pay tribute to the leadership of your great organization. There are no more able witnesses in behalf of the schoolchildren of America than Dr. Lyman Ginger and Miss Ruth Stout. The integrity and keen mind of Dr. Carr has for many years been an inspiration to those of us who have admired his ability before Congressional committees. The staff of the legislative division of the NEA—Jim McCaskill, Ernie Giddings, Bill McLin, John Lumley, Clayton Seeber, and the others who are behind the scenes but equally important, are respected, not only for their integrity but for their courtesy and devotion to the cause of education, even in the face of such bitter disappointments as have been their lot.

You may not know that I am a member of the department of rural education of the NEA. When I think of the contribution Howard Dawson and his staff have made through the years to the betterment of education in States such as my State of Montana and other rural areas of the country, I am indeed proud to be affiliated with this group. I am pleased, too, that the NEA recognized the worth of my two fellow Montanans, Mary Condon, and Jim Nicholson, and have brought them into the national staff.

I understand that some of you are State association secretaries, and I am aware of the splendid work you are doing for I know what my friend Dee Cooper does in Montana with a numerically limited but a highly able and efficient staff.

There is no question in my mind that the NEA as an entity is a most successful organization. I realize that seeking proper national legislation is only one of the responsibilities which your organization has. Teacher welfare, defense of academic freedom and of individual teachers, leadership in curriculum development, improvement in teacher education—all these are major responsibilities of the NEA which are recognized as proper concerns of the organized teacher profession. I am grateful to you for the remarkable record the NEA has made and will continue to make in these important areas. I am grateful too, for the assistance I have received from your legislative and research divisions in my work on the Committee on Education and Labor.

The educators of America have made a magnificent contribution to the growth of this Nation. Between 1870 and 1955, while our population was increasing four times, our public school attendance increased 80 times. From 1900 to 1955 the population of America nearly doubled, but the number of college graduates multiplied 11 times and the number of doctoral degrees 22 times. We have twice as many teachers as we had in 1910 but we require 10 times as many college teachers as we did 50 years ago. Today 43 million Americans are attending school—almost 1 out of every 4 people in this country—and 2 million Americans are teaching them in more than 150,000 institutions. At the same time while we have been increasing the quantity of education we have also been increasing the quality. More than anything else our American educational system is carrying out the American dream of equality of opportunity.

Some of this interest in education and especially in higher education is due to our recent years of prosperity, some to the GI bill which permitted thousands of ex-service men and women, who otherwise would have been unable to go to college, to complete their education. But there is a more fundamental reason for this growth. Even during the depression of the thirties college attendance grew. The chief characteristic of a complex modern society is the insatiable demand for educated people. It is not just technologists and scientists that we need, we need more and more gifted teachers, professional men, scholars, critics, poets. So when I talk about an educational crisis I am not overlooking the heroic efforts that our people are making and the effective job our educators are doing.

Nevertheless, we do have a crisis. Survey after survey has revealed our shortage of classrooms, teachers, of equipment. The Rockefeller Brothers Fund report released last Thursday succinctly summed up the situation by saying "Our schools are overcrowded, understaffed and ill-equipped." And the situation is getting worse. We have a shortage of about 142,000 classrooms despite the herculean efforts on the part of local communities to build schools. We are just about keeping up with the demands of our burgeoning population and are not making any appreciable inroads on the backlog we have permitted to accumulate. At the same time, district after district has exhausted its bonding capacity and taxes have been imposed at almost intolerable rates.

A few weeks ago, Mrs. Agnes Myer, testifying before the House Subcommittee on General Education in support of various bills for Federal aid, said, "There is nothing wrong with our public school system that money cannot cure." With that I agree. Adequate funds would permit us to have small classes in well-equipped buildings. More money would permit us to pay wages on a professional basis and compensate men and women in accordance with their responsibilities. There are other problems connected with the improvement of American education that you professionals are going to have to meet, but given the money to do it they can be solved.

Lots more dollars are being spent on education today than have been spent in the past. But we are educating lots more boys and girls so that since 1930 the relationship of expenditures for education has remained at a constant figure of about 3½ percent of our gross national product. Actually we are spending less today per pupil than we spent in 1930.

Traditionally the money to support our schools comes from local sources. In recent years the States have stepped in and provided equalization funds for operation and maintenance or for construction, or both. But essentially school financing has relied upon the tax base of the State and local taxing units. Primarily that is a property tax. The property tax is not a flexible tax, and many States and local communities are reluctant to impose too great a tax for fear of driving out industry. Also certain real property such as family dwellings are not income producing and therefore not a good tax source. But, as Senator MURRAY, the cosponsor of the Murray-Metcalf bill said in a speech on the Senate floor the other day, "Each child is a citizen, not only of the local community and of his State, but of the United States as well, and each segment of government has a continuing responsibility for him." So there is a Federal responsibility for education. And, in spite of the protests of the national chamber of commerce, there is sound precedent for Federal assistance to the States and local school districts for educational needs at all levels.

I am indebted to one of the witnesses from the chamber of commerce for a figure of 81 separate Federal-aid programs; I have never counted them but I will accept that figure. These include such longstanding programs as vocational education, school lunches, the GI bill that cost more than $8 billion, and so forth. One of the newest and most interesting is the so-called aid to impacted defense areas under Public Laws 815 and 874 of the 81st Congress. In the 7 years that this law has been on the statute books the Federal Government has spent $724 million in 3,756 districts to build classrooms to house more than a million children. Under Public Law 874, 490 million Federal dollars have been spent for operation and maintenance of 3,300 school districts with a total enrollment of 7.6 million children, or almost one-fourth of the total number of children attending public schools. Under Public Law 874 the money goes directly from the Federal Government to the local district, there is no intervening State agency, and that Federal money is used to purchase text books and pay teachers' salaries. Our experience under this law effectively answers those who charge that Federal aid means Federal control. If there was ever an opportunity for Federal control it would be under this program of direct grants where Uncle Sam sometimes contributes more than half the money needed for the current operating expenses of a local school district. In the most recent extension of these 2 laws, which has passed the House and is now pending in the Senate, the provision for Federal contribution for children whose parents both live and work on Federal property has been made permanent legislation. Thus, Congress has recognized that

there is a permanent and continuing Federal responsibility for education.

So, at the present time, the Federal Government is deeply involved in education and our educational system. There would seem to be very little question that the Federal Government, with its more flexible taxing power and its coequal responsibility for its young citizens, should step in and help alleviate our educational crisis. The cries of the chamber of commerce and the Farm Bureau about Federal control would be amusing but surprisingly enough those statements find a ready acceptance and, so far, any attempts to get Federal grants for construction or to pay teachers' salaries or other broad assistance programs have failed in Congress.

As a Member of Congress, I am convinced that there is a Federal responsibility for the training of our children that extends beyond the purchase of surplus products for school lunches or assistance confined to federally impacted areas. I believe that the only way we are going to overcome the classroom shortage and the teacher shortage is to use some of the Federal tax power. The only way we are going to get the 200,000 talented youngsters to make the utmost use of their talents and go on to more advanced training that they cannot now afford is to provide Federal scholarships. The only way we are going to have adequate facilities to take care of the increasing demand on our colleges is to give Federal support to higher education. The question today should be not whether or not there is going to be Federal support but from now on what kind of assistance is granted and what the priorities for such assistance are.

There are bills for several kinds of Federal aid pending in Congress at the present time. These include grants in aid for construction, loan programs, my own bill for a payment of $25 to each State for each school-age child in the next fiscal year, increasing at the rate of $25 per year until the maximum amount of $100 per child is reached in 4 years. This money can be used at the discretion of the State for either construction or teachers' salaries. Probably the proposal with the most popular appeal in this post-sputnik era is the Hill-Elliott bill for scholarships and Federal loan funds. The scholarship proposal avoids many of the thorny problems presented by other legislation. We have the precedent set by the GI bill. The money goes directly to the individual and he decides what university he wants to attend. Questions of segregated schools and private and secular schools are avoided. I am for the Elliott bill. Today work on it should be completed and the bill marked up and I will be back tomorrow in time to help vote it out of committee.

However, the scholarship proposal is not a solution for the greater problems of financing even higher education. The greatest need right now is money for construction of elementary and secondary classrooms. The grants in aid for construction involve a minimum of Federal control. Federal money goes to purchase building materials and pay labor and as soon as the building is completed the Federal Government is out of the picture. There is no more hazard of control over the minds of the boys and girls or over the curriculum than arises when the Federal Government builds highways or post offices. More questions arise when Federal money is used to pay teachers' salaries. As I have suggested, however, our experience with Public Law 874 has demonstrated that the Federal Government can go directly to the school district and contribute to operation and maintenance of schools without any efforts on the part of the Office of Education to dictate. Under the Murray-Metcalf bill there is an intervening agency, the State educational authority, which gives us an additional safeguard.

The Murray-Metcalf bill will cost about $1 billion the first year, rising to almost 4½ billion in the fourth year. As Federal programs go this is not a large amount. We have appropriated for defense for the next fiscal year about $40 billion. The DEW line (distant early warning) in Canada is going to cost $600 million and it will only give us about 4 hours' warning in case of attack. The SAGE installation when completed will cost $4 billion. Nor will the expenditure of $4 billion a year appreciably change the traditional local support of education. We are spending on education annually about $14 billion and the Murray-Metcalf bill has incorporated an effort formula that will require States and local school districts to maintain their appropriations so that the Federal money will be in addition to the State and local money. The Murray-Metcalf bill does face up to the two most crucial problems of our schools, the teacher shortage and the classroom shortage. The money provided, added to the continuing efforts of the States, will remove the shocking overcrowding in classrooms and obsolete buildings and relieve the teacher shortage due largely to the pitiful salaries paid in so many of our States.

When I introduced H. R. 10763 I was prepared to receive an inundation of letters criticizing the use of Federal money for the payment of teachers' salaries in public schools. I haven't received any letters stressing this point. I am convinced that the people of America are much more enlightened about educational needs than their elected representatives realize. The polls taken by Congressmen and the results obtained from such national surveys as the Gallup poll and the Roper poll amply demonstrate this.

But, I repeat, I am not wedded to any single approach, nor are most of my colleagues who are desirous of helping our educational system. I believe the Murray-Metcalf bill to be the best approach, but I will vote for the construction program that President Eisenhower sent to Congress last year and abandoned this year. I intend to vote for scholarships. I will vote for grants in aid for higher education or any other bill that preserves local leadership and control over the actual educational process and encourages the local agencies to continue to make every effort to use their own resources.

In 1937 I was a member of the Montana Legislature, representing my home county where there are 5 small high schools and 8 elementary districts. In that session we passed the first teachers' retirement system in Montana. While the bill was pending I was presented with a petition signed by 84 teachers in my county. I checked the names on the petition against the registration rolls and found that only 1 of the 84 was registered to vote. Now the sole purpose of a petition is to convey to an elected representative that the voters of his district are desirous of the passage of the legislation to which the petition is directed. Otherwise, one logical and well-reasoned letter would suffice. But a petition with only one registered voter doesn't have much effect.

I have been in Congress 6 years. Twice we have sent school-construction bills to the floor of the House and twice we have been defeated by a small majority, last year by five votes. This year the administration proposal failed to pass out of the House Committee on Education and Labor by a tie vote of 15 to 15. And that is where you come in.

I have tried to analyze why the million and a half classroom teachers in America are not more successful in educating their friends and neighbors to secure needed legislation for the support of schools. Certainly the fault does not lie with the testimony presented to the Congressional committees by the NEA. The statements this year before the House committee by the NEA are among the most able, complete, factual and convincing arguments that I have ever heard on any subject. But they fell on deaf ears, because half of the members of the committee prefer to listen to the half-truths and the tired, worn out arguments of the chamber of commerce. The issue was not decided in the hearings in the committee room. It had been decided long before on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of 1956.

The thing that continues to amaze me is the peculiar attitude of some educators that political action is somehow not a proper activity of good citizens. As a matter of fact, there is no more proper activity for an educated man or woman. And political activity does not mean signing a petition or writing to your Congressman or State senator, although that is important and helpful to him. Political activity means helping elect the kind of State and National representatives who represent your point of view, who will face facts, make honest judgments, and take positive action on an issue.

In the more than 20 years I have been in politics at the local, State, and national level, I can think of only a half dozen local school officials at a political meeting. A politician welcomes advice from educators before and after election, but politicians who speak for education would welcome a little vocal support during the campaign. If you don't get elected, you can't do the job.

Sometimes I think the crux of the problem lies in the fact that too many local educators are afraid of social ostracism if they oppose the local big shots on the subject of Federal support for the schools. They are afraid to speak up when the knife and fork crowd parrot the propaganda ground out by their national organizations. Do school administrators have a moral obligation to speak out against untruth, no matter who is offended? I think they do. They must face this responsibility to a more effective degree than has been true in the past. And I think you have to tell them so. Sure, sometimes it may mean laying a job on the line. Well, 435 Congressmen lay their jobs on the line every 2 years. I've found that a rather stimulating experience. Those same businessmen don't hesitate to aggressively participate in a political campaign to further their own interests. Farmers have found that they have to organize politically in order to obtain equality, labor leaders have learned that organization for collective bargaining is not enough, veterans have organized themselves into an effective lobby. Where do the educators get the idea that they are an exception?

What I'm getting at is that I believe too many rank-and-file members of the teaching profession miss too many opportunities to educate misguided civic leaders on the subject of Federal support for schools. Those who cynically use the argument that Federal aid means Federal control constantly propagandize the members of the local chamber of commerce on the subject. I receive letters every day from organization secretaries protesting my Federal-aid bill and many of these letters come from districts which receive substantial grants for vocational education, Public Law 874 money and other funds. When these matters are discussed in meetings or in the committees it is the job of the educators who know the facts to speak up. And school administrators are the key people in this respect. They are the ones who go to chamber of commerce meetings. I am afraid too many have lacked the courage to raise their voices at the proper time.

I don't know if the Murray-Metcalf bill will pass this year. I hope we can pass it. But I do know that if the members of the NEA do their job this fall in their respective political parties in speaking for it during the campaign we will pass a bill for Federal

assistance for teachers' salaries and construction early in the next Congress.

Time is running out. The future of our country will be won or lost in the classrooms. While we have debated and delayed a whole generation of elementary students have been forced to attend school on half shifts, in overcrowded classrooms, to learn science with makeshift equipment, to listen to uninspired teachers. This delay may determine the course of history for generations to come.

Help for the Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 3, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the people and the Government seem to be waking up to the dangerous plight of America's railroads. Sure, trains are still running, but they are getting fewer by the month, and shorter by the week.

For a long time people have been deserting the rails for the highways and the air, with a consequent general slump in business for the railroads.

Too many Americans fail to realize the Nation's dependence upon our railroads. When, because of bad weather or for other reasons, motor and air transportation fails, the public falls back on the reliable railroads. But, meanwhile, the people favor the rails' competition.

Not that airlines do not pay rentals to public-owned airports. Not that truck and bus operators do not pay stiff license fees for the use of the highways. Not that any of these carriers do not pay taxes, or is not subject to some degree of governmental regulation.

The trouble seems to be that a mountainous tax structure and a maze of regulations has been laid upon the railroads over the past century which so weighs them down and shackles them that they can no longer compete with newer systems of public transportation and stay solvent.

Much of the railroads' $27 billion of net assets are fixed. They are in land, buildings, and trackage which the railroads must maintain whether they run 100 trains or 10. And their local tax-load grows each year in the same proportion as the taxes of everyone else.

The railroads are no longer a transportation monopoly, yet they are regulated by Federal and State Governments as though they were.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the roads are allowed to go under as private enterprises, the Government will have to step in and take them over. Government tax money will have to run and rebuild them. For no other existing system of transportation can match the railroads in their ability to move volume, numbers, and weight with speed and safety despite weather conditions that defeat other carriers.

No other system provides a network so great and so massive on which to operate. The railroads are basic and they are indispensable.

I do not favor Government favoritism between transportation systems other than whatever passing favoritism may be needed to bring them all to that equality of opportunity where competition can be based purely on service rendered to the public.

It should be remembered that the alternative of having the railroads dumped into the Government's lap would prove far more expensive to the taxpayers and much less satisfactory for the public.

The Present Status of American Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 3, 1958

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on June 29, 1958, I interviewed the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, on the present status of American agriculture. The interview was carried by television station KTVT, in Salt Lake City, Utah, as well as many Utah radio stations, as a public-service feature. I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of the interview be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript of the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WATKINS AND SECRETARY BENSON DISCUSS AGRICULTURE

Senator WATKINS. Friends, this is another of the weekly reports from Washington. Today I have with me a very distinguished guest, a man whom you all love and respect.

A number of years ago, in 1953, to be exact, I was out of Washington at the time a caravan of farmers came to Washington to demand the resignation of the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson.

Having read the morning papers, I wired the President and told him in that wire that if the Secretary were permitted to serve out his term he would prove to be one of America's greatest Secretaries of Agriculture. I promptly received a return wire from the President in which he said: "He is now one of America's greatest Secretaries of Agriculture."

Well, friends, it's a great honor and a distinction today for me to introduce our distinguished citizen from Utah, Secretary Benson.

Secretary BENSON. Thank you very much, Senator WATKINS. It's a great pleasure to greet the people of Utah and to join you on this informal program.

Senator WATKINS. Well, Mr. Secretary, today I want to interview you about a number of important matters that farm people are interested in as well as our citizens generally, because we know the farm program has been one of the hottest subjects in the United States ever since you came to Washington.

Secretary BENSON. That's right.

WHY EISENHOWER-BENSON FARM PROGRAM IS SUCCEEDING

Senator WATKINS. And you have survived many a so-called crisis. Demands frequently have been made for your resignation, as I remember. But during the last few months, Mr. Secretary, I haven't noticed so many demands being made for your resignation, and I have reason to believe that it's not only because farm prices have improved greatly, but it is also because of the fact that you have stood for principle no matter how many things were said about you that were unfair by your critics. You have stood pat on what you have felt to be a sound program, and personally I have been very happy to support you.

Secretary BENSON. Thank you.

Senator WATKINS. Now, there has been a lot of improvement, has there not, in farm prices? I'm sure the farmers would like to know something about it. Suppose we start off with beef and cattle and calves.

FARM PRICES GENERALLY ON THE RISE

Secretary BENSON. Well, Senator WATKINS, there has been considerable general improvement starting way back in the fall of 1955 when the administration's program first started to take effect. And may I say to our friends in Utah that I'm very grateful for the support you have given, sir, to the development of a sound farm program. You introduced the bill in the Senate. You made an excellent speech in support of the provisions of that bill, and we have been able to get some of the legislation we wanted back in 1955. We still need some further change in the old basic law, but we have had considerable improvement.

Farm prices today are running about 9 percent ahead of a year ago, 10 percent ahead of 2 years ago, and they're 10 percent higher than when we left the so-called rigid supports on the basic commodities. Prices received for cattle and hogs are well over 90 percent of parity.

Senator WATKINS. As a matter of fact they're nearly 100 percent of parity now, aren't they?

UTAH FARM INCOME IMPROVES 2 YEARS IN A ROW

Secretary BENSON. Yes they are. Overall, however, the index is 86 percent of parity, but there's good volume, crop production has been good. So farm income has increased very substantially. Net income per farm in the State of Utah in 1957 was 10 percent ahead of 1956. If you take into consideration the inventories on hand, the increase was 16 percent, and so far this year prices in Utah have been running considerable ahead of last year: 7 percent higher than the same quarter, same period in 1957. So in general we're very much encouraged.

Our markets are expanding at home and abroad; conditions on farms are improving. I think we're on our way. Cattle prices, of course, are good. Hog prices are good. Calf prices are good. These we have already mentioned. We've also had some improvement in poultry prices and turkey prices as well.

Senator WATKINS. Now, I should point out that of course we had a severe drought a couple of years ago. In fact, a year ago I think we were still in a bad situation in many of the cattle growing States of the Union. To what do you attribute the increase in prices received by farmers for the cattle?

Secretary BENSON. There are a number of factors, of course. First of all, cattlemen very wisely reduced their numbers just a little last year and then too, we've had a continued very strong consumer demand for meat. Our per capita consumption of meat in this country, of beef, is running in the neighborhood of 85 pounds, which is near an all-time high. And then, of course, one factor in the market which is somewhat abnormal is the strong demand which many farmers and ranchers have for cattle at the market to restock their ranges which were depleted during this long period of drought, which you mentioned a moment ago.

Senator WATKINS. Well, they cut down on their numbers during the drought and now they want to renew their herds.

Secretary BENSON. That's right. They've got grass again, got feed, and so they want to restock their ranges and reestablish their breeding herds.

Senator WATKINS. Now let us turn to another farm activity.

IMPROVEMENT NOTED IN POULTRY AND TURKEY PRICES

Utah, as I remember, recently was listed as about No. 9 in the production of turkeys; and I know we've produced a lot of chickens and eggs. The poultry and turkey industries have been profitable ones for many of the farmers of the United States. Now what is the price situation with respect to turkeys and poultry products generally?

Secretary BENSON. Well, turkey prices this year are running about 4 cents a pound above a year ago, and egg prices have also shown considerable improvement, so we feel that the poultry industry as a whole is in much better shape this year than it was a year ago. The poultry industry has consistently resisted Government price supports and Government controls and regulations of their industry; and I think they've benefited by following that sound policy.

Senator WATKINS. You don't have any turkeys or poultry products now in storage, do you?

Secretary BENSON. No, that's true. We have nothing in Government stocks. Of course, if there should be a temporary market glut, we'd not hesitate to step in and buy some for school lunch or other outlets, but there's no Government controls on the poultry industry.

Senator WATKINS. Well, you do have authority to buy then if it's necessary to help in their marketing.

Secretary BENSON. That's right. If there should be a serious market glut we could step in with section 32 funds and purchase some products to relieve the situation. We've done that before and we would do it again.

BUILDING OF MARKETS, NOT PRICE SUPPORTS, AIDS POULTRY INDUSTRY

Senator WATKINS. Well now, in the case of poultry products, what is the real reason why they're in such good condition today, in your judgment?

Secretary BENSON. Well, first of all, they've produced a quality product, and they have consistently improved the quality of their poultry and their eggs. They have had a good program of promotion and advertisting. And the per capita consumption of poultry and eggs has increased very substantially, along with our increase in population which means that our markets for poultry products have broadened. And then we've also been alert to watch for new markets abroad. We've just developed a new poultry market for dressed poultry in Germany.

Senator WATKINS. I'm sure our audience would like to hear about that. Tell us how this new market was developed.

Secretary BENSON. We've had our marketing specialists abroad, and we've joined with representatives of the poultry industry in exploring the possibility of selling dressed poultry abroad. And the German market has opened up as a result, and last year we exported rather large quantities of dressed poultry into Germany. We think there's a great potential market there and also in some of the other countries with which we're working at the present time.

In other words, the poultry industry and the leaders of it have taken a progressive attitude. They've put their emphasis on markets and not on Government price-fixing and Government controls, and it's paid off for them.

Senator WATKINS. Well, now, for instance in the case of Germany, would that be a profitable market? Do they, can they get prices there that would justify the growing of poultry?

Secretary BENSON. Yes, indeed. These shipments have been commercial shipments. We assisted a little initially to help get the market open, but this will be a dollar transaction, a commercial sale, conducted through the regular channels of trade.

Senator WATKINS. Well I congratulate you, your associates, and the poultry producers on this joint undertaking.

PENDING TURKEY LEGISLATION SHOWS PROMISE

Senator WATKINS. Are you acquainted with a bill that's been introduced in the Congress to promote the marketing of turkeys, a bill which permits among other things, the scaling off of money to permit the growers to put on a real sales campaign?

Secretary BENSON. Yes; it's sort of enabling legislation which the industry has been working on for some time, and our technicians have been cooperating with them. It would permit them also to impose a marketing agreement and order on their industry to regulate the flow of their commodity to market and also to provide, as you've mentioned, funds for promotion. I think it has possibilities.

Senator WATKINS. Now, I have some questions about the wool, sheep, and lamb industry. I'm sure you're interested in that as well as I am. What is the general situation now with respect to this part of the livestock industry?

WOOL ACT EXTENSION LEGISLATION A MUST

Secretary BENSON. Well, as you know, we've had the wool program in operation for—what is it—3 years now. You were one of the promoters of that program.

Senator WATKINS. I now have a bill which is on the Senate Calendar to extend it. I happen to be a sponsor along with Senator BARRETT, and others as well, of S. 2861.

Secretary BENSON. Yes; that's true, and it's been reported out of the Senate Agriculture Committee and is now before the Senate, and I'm hopeful that the Senate will take favorable action on it very shortly. In the House we've got a rather difficult situation because it's been made part of an omnibus bill which is a sort of catchall. If the wool bill itself could be offered in the House, I'm sure it would pass and I am sure that it will pass in the Senate. We need it very badly and I hope the Congress will see fit to approve it soon.

Senator WATKINS. How has it worked out in practice to date?

Secretary BENSON. I think the sheepmen, generally, have been very pleased with it. We have been pleased in the Department. We think it meets the need of the sheep and wool industry.

Senator WATKINS. Well, I agree with you on that statement. I think, however, that many people throughout the United States feel that it is somewhat of a subsidy program and that we ought not to be encouraging more production of sheep and lambs and wool.

Secretary BENSON. Well, the Congress has determined that wool is a strategic fiber. They have set a goal of 300 million pounds of wool and have asked us to devise a program to achieve that goal. So this is a program using incentive to induce more production. It's entirely unlike programs dealing with surpluses; we have no surplus of wool. We only produce about a quarter to a third of what we consume domestically, but this program works to meet the need, the peculiar needs of the wool industry as well as those of consumers.

Senator WATKINS. How about any increase as a result of the program?

Secretary BENSON. We see evidence now of some little increase in wool production. We think it will be slow and gradual, but we think it will be solid and sound. It's not easy to get into the sheep business overnight, as you know Senator. It takes time.

Senator WATKINS. Yes; I've had some experience. I had a number of stockmen as clients when I was practicing law, and I also associated once in a sheep-feeding operation.

DAIRY SITUATION IMPROVING

Secretary BENSON. Well, we think we're making headway.

Senator WATKINS. Now we come to another activity in agriculture which has been the center of a lot of controversy. That's the dairy price support legislation. I remember awhile back you were under fire with respect to that program. Now what is happening?

Secretary BENSON. Well, as a matter of fact, we see some real improvement in the dairy situation. Some improvement in prices. Certainly we've seen some improvement in consumption, evidence that markets are expanding. There was a time when we had more than a billion and a half pounds of dairy products in Government storage. That was back in 1953 when we took office.

But we are moving ahead. We've heard a lot about the self-help plan. It was not truly a self-help plan; it would have brought the dairy industry under controls; it would have imposed marketing quotas, marketing allotments, and as a matter of fact it would have destroyed markets and interfered with our international relations. It was not a sound program for dairying. We do feel, however, that the things we are doing in the dairy industry are all to the good.

Senator WATKINS. And there's been a general improvement in the overall dairy situation, I mean as a general matter.

Secretary BENSON. That's right. Last year was the most profitable year we've ever had in the dairy industry.

Senator WATKINS. I'm glad to hear that, and it's been a great pleasure to have you with me on this program, Mr. Secretary. I'm sure the people of Utah have enjoyed it, too.

LAST PROGRAM IN CURRENT SERIES OF WASHINGTON REPORTS

This program concludes the series of television and radio programs which I have been bringing to the people of Utah in the nature of a report from Washington through the courtesy of the television station KTVT, and Utah radio stations too numerous to mention by name. I'm deeply grateful for their cooperation, and I thank all of you who have seen and/or who have listened to these programs. For now, then, I will say goodby.

Maj. Gen. Joe W. Kelly Praised for Work in Air Force Legislative Liaison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1958

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, so many plaudits and compliments have been heaped upon Maj. Gen. Joe W. Kelly recently by Members of both Houses of Congress that I find it difficult to rephrase the old ones or to create new ones to express my own admiration for him.

One Member of Congress said that General Kelly should some day be returned to Washington as the Chief of Staff of the Air Force. Another said that General Kelly leaves behind a multitude of friends on Capitol Hill, in the White

House, in the Pentagon, and all around Washington. Still another said that he had done a wonderful job as Director of Legislative Liaison for the Air Force. All of these remarks imply the wide breadth and range of his professional ability and his great personality.

I would feel remiss if I were not to add my name to those distinguished Members of Congress who have praised General Kelly and wished him success in his new job as commander of the Air Proving Ground.

While I regret deeply General Kelly's departure from the Office of Legislative Liaison, I look forward with confidence to the carrying on of his good work by his successor, Maj. Gen. William P. Fisher. To these fine Air Force leaders I extend my wishes for the best of luck and good flying.

Radiation Hazards Facing the States and the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1958

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an outstanding address delivered by the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Honorable CARL T. DURHAM. Our colleague made these remarks before a meeting of the National Association of Manufacturers in New York City on May 21, 1958, entitled "Radiation Hazards Facing the States and the Nation."

In view of the present efforts at Geneva to negotiate with the Soviet Union on limitation of nuclear-weapons tests, I believe Chairman DURHAM's address takes on additional significance. The chairman called for the development of a middle-ground approach. He suggested that such a middle ground might be found in consideration of international agreement on limitation of the amount of fissionable material deposited in the atmosphere by nuclear weapons tests or, alternatively, agreement to limit such tests in the future to underground shots.

Mr. DURHAM's address follows:

RADIATION HAZARDS FACING THE STATES AND NATION

(Remarks by Representative CARL T. DURHAM, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, before meeting of the National Association of Manufacturers, New York City, on May 31, 1958)

INTRODUCTION

It is a great pleasure to be with you here this evening and to be able to take part in your meeting on industrial uses of radiation and the role of the States in regulating these activities. This association is to be commended for its initiative in sponsoring these discussions on a subject area which is bound to grow in importance as we proceed further into the atomic age.

It is perhaps paradoxical that atomic radiation is a source of both hope and concern in the years just ahead. On the one hand we see whole new vistas being opened up in the medical uses of radiation to treat cancer and brain tumors and the application of radiation in the field of agriculture to produce hardier strains of plants and larger yields. In the industrial field, as you gentlemen well know, atomic radiation in the form of radioactive isotopes is performing a variety of jobs of assistance to manufacturers and is helping the chemical industry in its role as a catalytic agent.

But along with these benefits has come the problem of learning to live with this new source of energy and learning to respect its dangers as well as its advantages. This is particularly important as our atomic energy program emerges more and more from the strict controls of Government laboratories and diffuses itself into many hundreds of private industries and institutions throughout the country.

These potential dangers from radiation need not and should not cause us to halt our efforts directed toward peacetime industrial development of the atom. They do, however, pose a serious control problem, both at the national and the State level, and we must not let down our guard. We must not, in short, let our increasing familiarity with radiation breed carelessness in the handling of this potent new source of energy.

REACTOR HAZARDS

Perhaps the most obvious large scale source of atomic radiation which we will encounter in the next several decades is atomic reactors, especially the power producers whose cores will contain substantial quantities of hot uranium fuel and fission products created in the operation of the reactor. The neutrons emitted in the fissioning processes within the core, together with the associated fission products which circulate in the reactor system, could constitute a hazard to employees in the immediate plant area as well as populations in surrounding areas in the event of a large scale accident. For this reason a substantial margin of safety is standard procedure in the design of reactors, and an attempt is made to forestall any conceivable accident, whether it derives from component failures or human error.

Aside from care in the design and engineering of the reactor itself and its fuel elements, intricate control systems have been devised with "fail safe" characteristics so that if one mechanism does not operate another immediately takes over in an emergency. As a further safeguard, the larger powerplants, at least, are being required to have a gas-tight spherical steel chamber surrounding the reactor area so as to catch any particulate matter which might escape in the event of a meltdown of the core.

Despite these elaborate precautions, there is of course the remote possibility that an unlikely combination of circumstances might result in a nuclear incident which could breach the containment chamber around the reactor and release fission products into the surrounding atmosphere. In densely populated areas of our larger cities, this could pose a serious contamination problem and the threat of injury to persons in the area who do not have adequate shelter or are unable to disperse promptly. To minimize this danger an effort is being made to locate power reactors, particularly the larger ones, in areas sufficiently removed from populated centers.

Recognizing that the Congress and the public needed more detailed information on the problem of reactor hazards, the Joint Committe asked the AEC back in July of 1956 to have a report prepared for distribution. The resulting study, primarily done by the Brookhaven Laboratory, has served as a useful source of information on this subject, including the problems associated with major reactor incidents. The committee has more recently been urging the AEC to establish firm criteria with regard to the location of power reactors near populated centers.

INDEMNITY AGAINST REACTOR HAZARDS

Several years ago the Joint Committee became concerned over the problem of providing financial protection for reactor operators and manufacturers in the event of a major atomic incident. More important, there was the protection of the public in heavily congested urban areas who might incur serious injury from the fallout of the fissionable material released in an accident. It was apparent that this was becoming a road block to the advancement of our peacetime atomic power program. To find out more about the nature of the problem and possible measures which might be taken, the Joint Committee called together a group of experts representing the major areas affected and conducted an informal seminar on the problem. The results of the seminar were most useful and following public hearings a bill was reported out by the committee to provide governmental indemnity against reactor hazards, covering third party liability claims. The Indemnity Act was duly passed during the last session of Congress.

One of the provisions of the Indemnity Act, better known now as Public Law 85–256, was that the Commission should issue a report to the Joint Committee on April 1 of this year on the status of the program and its administration. This report was presented to the Committee last month and on May 8 the Committee held public hearings on it. The hearings brought out a number of interesting points regarding the operation of the law provided an opportunity to discuss some of the problems which are being encountered.

As indicated at the hearings, one of the major needs at the moment is for the formulation of a definitive set of regulations by the Commission to replace the temporary regulations now in effect. This, I hope, can be accomplished within a reasonably short period of time so that atomic industry will know where it stands on the indemnity question.

REACTOR SAFEGUARDS COMMITTEE

In considering the proposed indemnity bills the Joint Committee added three sections which established the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, and required public hearings and public safety reports on all power and test reactors. The functions of the Advisory Committee was described as follows:

"The Committee shall review safety studies and facility license applications referred to it and shall make reports thereon, shall advise the Commission with regard to the hazards of proposed or existing reactor facilities and the adequacy of proposed reactor safety standards, and shall perform such other duties as the Commission may request."

The May 8 hearing on the operation of the Indemnity Act included discussion of those sections which established the Advisory Committee and required public hearings and public safety reports. Although there was some fear that a legal opinion of the AEC might tend to limit the scope or effectiveness of the Advisory Committee, the matter was resolved satisfactorily. During the course of the hearing, Commission representatives made clear that they would welcome any advice from the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee, as a matter of law, is to have access to all technical reports. It is also authorized to review any matter which it might deem worthy of its attention and to bring it to the attention of the AEC and the Joint Committee. On the other hand, the Advisory Committee is not to become burdened down with operational responsibilities.

WASTE DISPOSAL

Another source of radiation which will become increasingly important as our atomic-power program progresses is that of so-called atomic waste. Radioactive waste materials are formed in all stages of atomic-energy operations, including uranium mining and milling facilities, in feed materials, plants, in reactor operations, and in plants to reprocess the spent fuel elements. Some of these waste materials are highly radioactive and contain isotopes with very long lives.

The extent of the hazards from these radioactive wastes is still undetermined, and the Special Subcommittee on Radiation of the Joint Committee has planned some public hearings on industrial radioactive-waste-disposal problems. These hearings had originally been scheduled to be held beginning late last month, and several preparatory meetings had taken place with an advisory panel of experts. But because of delay in receipt of the proposed AEC fiscal year 1959 authorization bill and the necessary hearings on that bill, the waste-disposal hearings have been postponed, and are now tentatively planned to be held in the latter part of June 1958. However, the outline of the hearings is fairly firm, and will cover the following subjects:

1. Nature of radioactive wastes, including sources, quantities, and characteristics;

2. Waste management operations, including existing operational methods and procedures utilized in the collection, handling, processing, and disposal of waste materials;

3. The-waste-disposal research and development program, including methods of ground disposal, disposal at sea, fixation, and separation of specific long-lived isotopes;

4. Future estimates and economics of waste disposal, including information of the possible effects of future quantities of radioactive wastes on man and his environment;

5. Administrative and policy aspects, including legal, regulatory, and the role of Federal-State agencies;

6. And, finally, industrial and international aspects of the waste-disposal problems.

The Joint Committee hopes that these hearings will contribute to the knowledge of our committee, the Congress, and the public and that a record will be made similar to that of the hearings by the Special Subcommittee—last year—on the Nature of Radioactive Fallout and Its Effects on Man. The same procedures will be followed, in that we are requesting that the testimony be presented in a form understandable to the layman. At the same time, qualified witnesses are being encouraged to include in the record technical reports to describe their subjects completely. In addition, there will be questions from the committee members and staff, and round-table discussions at the end of each morning, in which the various technical experts will sit around the table and discuss with the committee members some of the major problems. This seminar technique proved particularly valuable and productive at last year's fallout hearings.

As a result of these waste-disposal hearings we hope that the record will enable us to approach more intelligently some of the tough questions in this field which lie ahead, such as:

What will be the quantity accumulation of radioactive-waste materials over the next 10, 20, or 50 years?

How great a hazard to the public will these radioactive-waste materials create?

What sort of safety devices and procedures should be used?

Will the problem of radioactive-waste materials be a damper or a limitation on our atomic-power program or the other increasing peaceful uses of atomic energy?

What means are there for recovering useful materials from waste products for applications in the medical, biological, and other fields?

And finally, what sort of research-and-development program should be pursued further in order to improve our technical knowledge and help our search for solutions?

The hearings on industrial radioactive waste disposal problems should be helpful and I hope that the many members of your organization will follow them with some interest.

EMPLOYEE RADIATION HAZARDS AND WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

A third problem which we are going to be faced with as we progress further into the peacetime development of atomic energy is the question of employee radiation hazards and workmen's compensation. This is a matter of considerable interest to the Joint Committee and we did at one time have tentative plans for holding public hearings on the subject next month. However, as I mentioned previously, the delay in receiving the AEC 1959 authorization bill has caused a crowding in the committee's schedule and it has been decided to postpone these public hearings until early in the next session. I hope that in the interim both the committee and the AEC, together with probable participants in the hearings, will have a better opportunity to prepare for an intelligent discussion of these complex matters. To this end, the committee has asked the AEC to prepare a report for submission by January 1 of next year. It is probable that this report will serve, at least in part, as a basis for the hearings.

Among the topics to be discussed at the hearings will be standards governing radiation exposures and their historical development over the years. Much of this history, of course, will cover the experience which we have had with handling radium and medical uses of X-rays. Such a review will be useful in terms of setting the background for a discussion on atomic radiation problems and safety measures in the atomic field. We are to hear testimony on the origin and nature of industrial hazards and radiation injuries, including the sources of such injuries, such as reactors and isotopes, and including such things as mining, milling, and processing. We will then dwell briefly on the kinds of injury which can be expected and will receive testimony from experts in the medical profession on this point.

Perhaps the most useful part of the hearing will occur when we take specific examples of industrial experience at individual installations and analyze them in some detail. Thus we expect to have people from different kinds of installations, both AEC and private, come in and tell us the types of problems which they face on a day-to-day basis and the types of measures they are employing to maximize worker safety. These include physical and personnel protective measures, such as shielding, special clothing, gloves, periodical medical checkups, etc. They also include such things as instrumentation and monitoring of radiation levels within facilities and local administrative controls, including frequent inspection, monitoring of personnel and health physics. We also hope to cover the types of education and training programs which have been adopted in these installations and receive suggestions on how to create a greater sense of alertness to danger on the part of employees working in the installations.

At that point we might logically go into a discussion of current Federal and State activities with regard to employee radiation protection. These activities include licensing provisions, inspection and enforcement of safety. Quite naturally the conduct of these activities among the AEC and other Federal agencies and among the States will vary somewhat from case to case. This is only natural in view of the differing approaches in various parts of the country to the control of radiation and the differing degrees of interest reflected in the Federal Government and in State capitals. While it would be premature to say that every State should adopt identical statutory language to provide for controls on radiation activities, I do think that it would be unfortunate if we should find ourselves 10 years hence with 48 different laws and with no adequate means of dealing with atomic radiation problems which might well cross over State boundaries. At the moment, of course, few States do have comprehensive legislation in this field and I hope that meetings such as the one we are attending today will serve the useful purpose of focusing attention on the need for the States to do some really hard thinking about this problem.

Discussion of these matters inevitably leads into questions involving the legal implications of employee radiation injury or disability and workmen's compensation. The committee will be considering, in this regard, the general medical-legal implications of occupational accidents and injuries, including coverage, determination of what an injury actually is, the wage loss theory and the complex question of the statute of limitations in cases of radiation injury.

As part of this discussion the committee will probably consider existing laws and practices and the experience which the AEC has had through its contract operations. We will also get into the question of what role private insurance carriers play under these contract operations.

We will also, of course, consider in some detail the workmen's compensation laws of the various States and how private insurance carriers fit into this picture. Since most workmen's compensation laws are covered by State statutes, the bulk of the experience with operation of these laws is, of course, in the States and we shall hope to profit from their experience. There are a few Federal compensation statutes covering specialized employees, such as longshoremen, and we shall naturally be interested in how they have operated.

Finally, the committee will probably want to deal briefly with some of the proposed laws and practices including inadequacies of present laws and regulations, recommended State action, and proposals for Federal action. I would expect, in this connection, that there would be some discussion of suggestions for the establishment of Federal standards and means of compliance with the standards.

ROLE OF THE STATES

I come now to the respective roles which our State and Federal Governments might play in regulating and assisting our growing atomic-energy industry.

Originally, of course, the Federal Government assumed the complete responsibility in this field, since our atomic-energy program was born during World War II and was largely concerned with military necessities. Then, after the amendment of the Atomic Energy Act in 1954 which made possible private ownership and operation of atomic reactors, the AEC assumed certain licensing functions and passed upon the safety design features of each proposed facility. This was only proper, in view of the 10 years' experience of the AEC with large reactors at Hanford, and subsequently in Savannah River and other AEC laboratories and installations.

It should be emphasized, and I would like to say here again, that the AEC has had a very, very good safety record in controlling radiation hazards, and we have had very few atomic energy accidents, considering the size, scope, and varied activities of the atomic energy program.

The Federal Atomic Energy Act of 1954 specifies certain types of licenses which the AEC has authority to grant, and the AEC

regulations under the act spell out certain minimum standards of protection against radiation, and procedures for submitting technical information in order to obtain a construction permit and later an operating license.

Now, let us look at the other side of the coin. There is, of course, an increasing interest in the various State Governments concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy, as radioisotopes are now being used throughout our 48 States, and atomic power reactors are being built or planned in Illinois, Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Florida, California, and in my own backyard, at Parr-Shoals, S. C. Naturally, the States, with their traditional concern for the health and safety of their citizens, feel that they must also know something of these projects and satisfy themselves that they are safe, and that they do not endanger the health and safety of persons living nearby.

Now, as to the respective roles of the States and the Federal Government, we come across some knotty questions:

Can the States set up safety standards which are even more stringent than those already required by the AEC?

If so, would this impose an unreasonable burden upon the reactor manufacturer or the operator who has already gone through a long procedure with AEC?

Or, has the Federal Government, as the lawyers would say, "preempted the field" so that any State laws or regulations which conflict with the Federal standards and laws might be ineffective? One suggestion which has been made, in this regard, is that AEC set the standards and be given the authority to delegate responsibility for their enforcement to the States.

Coming to the role of the Joint Committee—should the Atomic Energy Act be amended to clarify the respective roles of the States and Federal Government, or to permit the States to assume more regulatory responsibility in this field?

On the other hand, are the States ready to assume responsibility, and do they have sufficient numbers of qualified technical personnel to pass on difficult questions of radiation hazards from specific designs?

For my own feelings at this time, I hope that the AEC is doing everything possible to work closely with the States, and to help train their personnel, and include them in the inspection and regulatory aspects of these new reactor projects. As the State governments become more and more qualified, they should be encouraged to take on some of the regulatory responsibility.

The Joint Committee had previously hoped to be able to hold some hearings this year on the Federal-State regulatory relationships in the atomic-energy field, but due to our heavy schedule of work in the remainder of the session it seems advisable to postpone these hearings until next year. In the meantime, after Congress adjourns this summer (and I hope that it will be early even though I have no opponent in the elections in North Carolina in November), I have instructed the staff of the Joint Committee to undertake during the recess a study of the problems and the developments, both on the Federal and the State levels, in regulating the peaceful uses of the atom.

I hope, therefore, that next year, after the committee staff study and report, our committee will be able to hold fruitful hearings on this subject, and consider possible amendments to the Atomic Energy Act.

FALLOUT FROM NUCLEAR-WEAPONS TEST

Before concluding my remarks I would like to touch briefly on another radiation problem of national concern. I recognize that it is not directly related to the subject matter under discussion this evening, but is, nevertheless, a problem of considerable concern to millions of people in this country and throughout the world. I am referring, of course, to the question of radioactive fallout from nuclear-weapons tests and the effect which such fallout is having on the human race. Closely associated with this problem is the question which has been very much in the public eye for the past several months of whether or not the United States should cease, or at least limit, its nuclear-weapons tests.

As many of you probably know, the Joint Committee has been concerned for some time over the fallout question and conducted the extensive series of public hearings last spring on this subject, to which I have already referred. I would like to read a few paragraphs from the summary analysis of these hearings which was issued by the committee last August. As to the effects of past tests, the analysis noted, and I quote:

"It was clearly shown by the testimony presented to the committee that man's exposure to fallout radiation, including strontium 90, is and will be generally small, for the testing already done, compared with his exposure to other normal background sources of radiation and * * * even compared with variations in normal background sources. But it was not agreed among the participating scientists on how this information should be interpreted."

As to the effects of future tests, the analysis noted, and I quote:

"There were differences of opinion on how to forecast the consequences of further testing. The differences hardest to reconcile seemed to be those concerning the biological effects of radiation. Pending a resolution of these differences, it would appear from the information presented that the consequences of further testing over the next several generations, at the level of testing of the past 5 years, could constitute a hazard to the world's population. It is very difficult, if not impossible, to forecast with any real precision the number of people that would be affected."

Despite differences of opinion on many of the major issues discussed at the hearings, there was strong agreement among the witnesses that greater efforts and large budgetary outlays, both private and Government, will be required for our research program in the sciences related to fallout. Such research is apparently going to be necessary if we are to accomplish our objectives of achieving a better understanding of this difficult and complex problem.

I am glad to note in this regard that the AEC has asked for an additional $2 million in its 1959 budget for construction of new facilities to assist in this research. I anticipate that this and other aspects of the fallout problem will be the subject of a second series of hearings by the Joint Committee later in the present session of Congress. These hearings will be devoted primarily to finding out what progress has been made since our hearings last year with regard to the research program and to discussion of some of the major questions which still remain unresolved. Among these are the question of nonuniformity of stratospheric fallout and discussion of predictions as to effects of future tests, including the effects of carbon-14.

LIMITATION OF NUCLEAR-WEAPONS TESTS

I shall not attempt to present to you this evening any definitive proposals for a solution to the question of cessation or limitation of nuclear-weapons tests. A great deal has been said about this problem, both in the Congress and by the executive branch and in public discussion groups.

Many of the positions taken have been rigid in nature and supporting justification has been emotional in tone. Spokesmen for the continuation of tests have often strayed into extraneous arguments which have served to undercut the best and most worthy arguments on behalf of continued testing. On the other hand, many of those who argue so vociferously for immediate cessation of tests fall prey to the same type of pitfall and actually tend to undermine their own case.

In this latter category, there is reason to believe that some people at least, are far more fearful of what they consider to be the war-creating potential of continued testing than they are of the effects of fallout. But they are aware of the highly emotional aspects of the fallout question and are utilizing public concern over this issue to drive home their point about stopping current tests as a part of the weapons race.

What I would like to do now is to suggest a few approaches for your consideration which might prove fruitful in our quest for some means of alleviating present differences of opinion on the matter and achieving a workable international agreement. These are essentially attempts to find a middle ground on which agreement can be based.

I think I can say that all of us are sincerely looking toward the day when an effective international agreement can be reached on disarmament between the free world and the Soviet bloc nations. Up until recently the Administration has taken the position that weapons testing is an integral part of any disarmament agreement and that it should be considered inseparable from the overall disarmament question.

However, I think it is becoming clear that there is room for effective international negotiation on the bomb test issue alone which could result in some form of constructive agreement short of a general disarmament agreement. This is a possibility we should explore to the fullest, not only from our own point of view but from the point of view of regaining the initiative with the rest of the world.

All of us, quite naturally, would oppose any international agreement on testing which would endanger the national security and weaken the resources of the Free World relative to the Communist world. On the other hand, it seems to me that there may be a useful area to explore; namely, agreement on limitation of the amount of fissionable material which is deposited in the atmosphere by nuclear weapons tests. Such agreement would be an important first step toward the ultimate cessation of tests and would serve the vital purpose of cutting down on the amount of radioactive contamination of the world's atmosphere.

A second approach which might be worth exploring is a possible international agreement on limiting nuclear weapons tests to underground shots, thus preventing atmospheric contamination altogether. This could, of course, impose severe limitations on the size of weapons which could be tested and could also prevent the effective testing of certain defensive weapons devices. It would, however, avoid the necessity for abandoning altogether the possibility of testing smaller tactical weapons and defensive weapons which may be developed in the future.

Of course, any international agreement, to be effective, must rely heavily on an effective means of international inspection and detection. This, as you can gather, is not a simple question but I tend to believe that it is not an insoluble one, either. But the United States and the rest of the Free World must make the attempt to work out an effective inspection system and I think the sooner we call the Communists' bluff on this one, the better. At the very least, we should offer to sit down at the table with the Soviets and negotiate seriously on this matter, following the completion of our present test series.

I would like to thank you very much again for inviting me to be with you here this evening. It has been a great pleasure.

Address by Secretary of the Army at Dedication of Eisenhower Lock, St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 3, 1958

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on yesterday, I had a very fine experience when I flew up the valley of the St. Lawrence and saw the waters of that river go through the wonderful channels which have been constructed to harness its power.

The Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, the Secretary of the Army, was present to dedicate the Eisenhower lock on the new seaway, and delivered a very fine address. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE WILBER M. BRUCKER, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, EISENHOWER LOCK DEDICATION, ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY, MASSENA, N. Y., JULY 2, 1958

It seems but a very short time ago that the President of the United States placed his signature upon the Wiley-Dondero bill—on May 13, 1954—authorizing the commencement of these mighty works which we see before us today, and which stretch eastward and westward for many miles beyond the limits of our vision. It is most fitting that this lock, a key feature in the series of 7 locks and 4 bypass canals, should bear the name "The Dwight D. Eisenhower lock."

As early as the year 1917, legislation was introduced in the Congress by that beloved son of New York State, the late Bertrand H. Snell, of Potsdam, to authorize United States participation with Canada in the exploitation of the navigation potential of this great river. For over 35 years the St. Lawrence Seaway project was debated and discussed, studied and analyzed in the United States and in Canada. Finally, a workable self-liquidating system of financing was evolved which commended itself to our Congress, and the St. Lawrence Seaway dream became a legislative reality during the first term of President Eisenhower.

The President has sent me the following message for this occasion:

"DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Please give my greetings to all assembled at the ceremonies marking the opening of the United States locks on the Wiley-Dondero Canal of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

"At this historic moment, it is fitting to pay tribute to those United States and Canadian leaders whose vision and labors have brought this great achievement into being. Together with the progress on the associated hydroelectric power projects, these works symbolize the accomplishments which are possible when two nations cooperate in peaceful endeavor.

"To those who have given—and to those who are giving—their time and talents to the completion of this splendid enterprise, I extend congratulations. To our Canadian partners, I pledge anew our continued support in the future development and use of these international waters.

"Sincerely,

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

My former chief, Charles E. Wilson, for over 5 years the Secretary of Defense, who is unable to be with us today, sent the following letter of regrets.

"I very much regret the inability of Mrs. Wilson and myself to be present at the opening of the United States locks on the St. Lawrence Seaway. The inauguration of seaway navigation is an event to which we have all long looked forward—a moment of far-reaching significance to the Midwest, to the United States, and to this continent. The power works, which I understand are being simultaneously dedicated, are of course among the most magnificent hydroelectric achievements in our history. I am proud to have been associated as Secretary of Defense with the inception of seaway and power construction, and to have seen it through until my retirement from that office.

"I send best wishes to you and to those assembled with you at these dedication ceremonies. It is a historic moment for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence region, and I congratulate all who have participated in this magnificent achievement.

"Sincerely yours,

"CHARLES E. WILSON."

Credit for the success of this first stage belongs largely to men of vision, such as Senator Alexander Wiley, former Congressman George Dondero, Lewis Castle, and a host of others, some of whom are here today with me on this platform, and whose tireless energies were there expended in promoting the legislation and steering it through the Senate, and to the ultimate signature by the President.

Thereafter, in accordance with legislative direction, the navigation and power projects, as described in the joint Canadian and United States engineering studies, which had received the approval of both of our Governments, was undertaken by the four corporate entities—2 in the United States and 2 in Canada—responsible for the actual construction of these mammoth seaway and power works. Within a few months after the enabling seaway legislation had passed our Congress, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation was a functioning Federal Agency, and had engaged the United States Army Corps of Engineers to supervise construction on behalf of the Corporation.

Here today we see before us one of the major structures in completed form on which the Seaway Corporation and our Army Engineers have coordinated their efforts during the last 4 years. And of course, neither this great lock nor any of the other features of the United States portion of the seaway would have been possible had it not been for the magnificent cooperation, technical skill, and friendly assistance provided by the Government of Canada, the Province of Ontario, and the State of New York, through their respective seaway and power entities.

The Eisenhower lock and Snell lock to be dedicated later today, together with the Wiley-Dondero Canal, constituted the principal United States seaway works. The Government of Canada is constructing 5 other locks and 3 bypass canals to the east and west of us, as well as many highway and bridge structures to modernize the highway traffic network which crosses this river between our 2 great countries.

Today's dedication would, of course, not have been set for this specific time had it not been for the fact that one of the greatest power structures in the United States, the Barnhart Island Power Dam, is now being put in service with the raising of its power pool, which commenced yesterday under supervision of the Federal Power Commission and the Joint Board of Engineers. As that power pool rises behind the Barnhart Island Power Dam, and behind the stop logs which cut off the former Canadian canal at Cornwall across the river from us, huge areas of this valley will be flooded out. Shallow draft river traffic formerly passing through the Canadian canals will then be diverted through the structures which we dedicate today. Next year, deep-draft vessels will be able to negotiate these facilities, and enter the Great Lakes.

Of course, in passing the Seaway Act of 1954, the United States Congress was not unmindful of the necessity for deepening to 27 feet those channels of the Great Lakes which will carry the newly introduced deep-draft vessels throughout the lakes, and as far west as Duluth, Minn. Consequently the 1956 connecting channels legislation authorized the Army Corps of Engineers to improve—at a cost roughly equal to the United States seaway costs in the St. Lawrence River—the balance of the route through the Great Lakes to the western end of Lake Superior. Last year it was my privilege to set off the first underwater blast signaling the commencement of work in the Amherstburg Channel of the Detroit River, and that significant connecting channel's work is moving forward, under the Corps of Engineers of the Army.

When all improvement dredging for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway is complete, Canada and the United States will then have a land-protected navigation route leading over 2,300 miles from the Atlantic Ocean up the St. Lawrence River and through the Great Lakes to Duluth, Minn. It will carry not only the commerce of peace, but, if necessary, the sinews of war. Its use for the transportation of the iron ore, steel, and fabricated weapons required for the defense of this continent and our allies would reduce by 1,000 miles the present open-sea route to the British Isles.

It is a matter of great significance that concentrated around the shoreline of the Great Lakes are factories, railroad terminals, mines, smelters, ports, and population centers, which, taken together, constitute the greatest industrial complex of this hemisphere. Four-fifths of the smelting capacity of our country is located in just one segment of the Great Lakes area, that which lies north of the Ohio River and between the Allegheny Mountains and the Mississippi. Shipbuilding and ship-repair facilities for oceangoing vessels will become convenient to our Atlantic coast when the seaway is open throughout its entire length. Iron ore can be transported from mine to smelter, from smelter to steel plant, and thereafter from steel plant to fabricating factory without ever entering upon the open sea. It is too obvious to require further elaboration that the greatest manufacturing area of this country will immeasurably benefit from the facilities which we put in operation today and because of that regional benefit, all our studies lead us to believe that the Nation as a whole will take great advantage from these improvements.

The completion of the St. Lawrence River power and navigation projects involves a combined project cost of more than $1 billion. Excavation totals are in excess of 210 million cubic yards of earth and rock removal. Six million one hundred and ninety-six thousand cubic yards of concrete have been placed, 42 miles of highway and 35 miles of railroad track have been relocated, and at the peak construction period some 22,000 workers were employed on the seaway-power projects in the St. Lawrence Valley. I do not wish to overwhelm you with statistics, but it is difficult without knowledge of these stupendous figures to grasp the magnitude of the work which has been accomplished under the direction of those who are here today on this platform.

Those of us who are from the Great Lakes area of this country have long realized that the key to expansion of the industrial might and the creative potential of the Great Lakes Basin is the St. Lawrence Valley. And

we knew as well that our contacts with foreign markets—markets for our wheat, fabricated steel, automobiles and trucks, and a myriad of other products—could never be successfully established until the St. Lawrence Rapids were bypassed by locks and canals of sufficient magnitude to accommodate fleets of oceangoing vessels.

During my satisfying association in Washington with these magnificent seaway and power accomplishments, I have many times had occasion to compliment the engineers whose technical skills have translated the dream of the explorer, the trader, and later the businessman, into executed designs and blueprints, and finally into physical reality. I am humbly proud that as Secretary of the Army I have had the opportunity to see at firsthand the magnificent contributions made to this project by the Seaway Corporation, whose Administrator, Mr. Lewis Castle, along with his Deputy, Martin Oettershagen and their staff, are with us here today, and also by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. The corps is represented here beside me by the Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, as well as his seaway assistants, Maj. Gen. Charles G. Holle, Maj. Gen. Louis J. Rumaggi, and the Buffalo district engineer, Col. Loren W. Olmstead.

It is sometimes thought that engineering is all there is to one of these projects. There are, on the other hand, those who consider that the political arrangements which precede and accompany construction of an international project of this kind are its most important feature. We have here today larger locks, deeper channels, higher bridges, and wider canals than have ever before been seen in the St. Lawrence Valley. I feel sure that a magnificent tribute is owing both to our engineers, and to our legislators and the men in high executive positions in Ottawa and in Washington, in Montreal and in New York, who solved the political problems which confronted us when this great project was undertaken.

As General Counsel of the Defense Department in 1954, it was my privilege to be associated with the Honorable Robert Anderson, then Deputy Secretary of Defense, and now Secretary of the Treasury, who has consented to join us today on this platform. I can tell you that without his skillful negotiations, infinite patience, and tact this project might well have faltered and stopped before it even got under way. It must be remembered that at least 10 governmental units, under the jurisdiction of four different political communities, had to cooperate and coordinate their work in order to achieve the results which you see here today. In addition to the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, a United States Federal agency, these works represent also the fruit of the labors of the Power Authority of the State of New York, the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada, and the Hydroelectric Power Commission of Ontario. To their efforts were added the efforts of still others, including the International Joint Commission and its subsidiary Joint Board of Control, the Canadian-United States Joint Board of Engineers, the Canadian Department of Transport, the Treasury Department, the Federal Power Commission, and also the United States Army Corps of Engineers to which I have already made reference. Without the engineering, the political, the legal, and the financial skills of representatives of all these entities, these great navigation and power works would never have become a reality. In the future, as we move into the next phase—commercial exploitation of the seaway—the Secretary of Commerce will play an increasingly important role in major seaway policy decisions.

Much has already been said about the magnitude of this particular venture. I almost hesitate to present to you some additional facts and figures representing its size. However, my remarks would not be complete unless I were to remind you that the traffic which will pass through the Great Lakes will serve a region whose water surface has an area of 95,000 square miles; that the Great Lakes have a shore line of 8,300 miles, and that the region constitutes a drainage area of 300,000 square miles. Some conception of the traffic potential through the St. Lawrence Seaway can be gained from figures relating to commerce passing through the Corps of Engineers locks at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., in 1954, 132 million tons of traffic traversed those locks. This incidentally, is twice as much as the estimated capacity of the new St. Lawrence Seaway. The number of vessels which can be expected to use the seaway is equally impressive. Taking an example from my own home city of Detroit, it is estimated that over 30,000 ships pass through the Detroit River during the 8½ months of the navigation season.

It is evident from these figures that the commercial traffic potential of the navigation works we see before us is for all practical purposes limitless, restricted only by the present and future capacity of the works themselves to carry the abundance of ships and goods which will be offered for transit.

The United States Coast Guard will have the honor of furnishing the first vessel to transit these facilities. The Coast Guard cutter *Maple* will tomorrow lead a parade of vessels spearheading the traffic which will be diverted from the Canadian canals at Cornwall through the Eisenhower and Snell locks, and through the Wiley-Dondero Canal. As we stand here today, we can visualize the flotillas of the future which will pass in ever-increasing numbers through our seaway facilities. They will bring with them from the East the traffic of many lands, the traditions of many far places, the seamen of many nations. From the West they will carry to foreign markets our manufactured products, our natural resources, and many of the crops which our Midwest produces in such abundance.

On May 28 of last year, at the connecting channels inauguration ceremonies in the Detroit River, the Netherlands Ambassador, Dr. Van Rotjen, made some most appropriate remarks in which he characterized the seaway and connecting channels projects as "of paramount importance to the whole trading world and to the countries of the Western World in particular." He went on to say: "The Atlantic Ocean is the lifelink of the free Western World. To extend that link to the States and Provinces bordering on the Great Lakes can only strengthen this community of free peoples."

It is entirely fitting that this valley should become an artery of traffic from many nations, for the history of the St. Lawrence is the history of explorers and men of adventure, traders, missionaries, and warriors, who sought to unlock the secret interior of our continent long before the days of rail and highway traffic. It was in the year 1534 that the explorer Jacques Cartier learned, at the site of what is now the city of Montreal, of great inland waters, from his Indian guides. He also learned that the water route to the Great Lakes was barred by dangerous rapids. Today we witness the works which, thanks to the ingenuity of the engineers who evolved these seaway locks and bypass canals, overcome these ancient hazards.

We are a part of the current of history. As we participate in these ceremonies, we are borne along toward an ever-greater prosperity, and an ever more secure peace, dependent upon friendly trade between nations, and upon mutual trust and confidence, such as that which has characterized our long and happy relations with our good neighbors in Canada. I look upon this seaway and power project as a magnificent and permanent symbol of what can be achieved by men of goodwill. We who are the fortunate citizens of two great nations, can take pride in the fact that we have set an example to all the world of peaceful accomplishment in this peaceful St. Lawrence Valley.

And now, on behalf of the United States Government, I am privileged to open this completed St. Lawrence Seaway lock, and to dedicate it as "the Dwight D. Eisenhower lock."

Tenth Anniversary of the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 3, 1958

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a significant speech delivered by Representative ROBERT W. KEAN of the 12th Congressional District of New Jersey at a celebration in Long Branch, N. J., on June 1, marking the 10th anniversary of the State of Israel. Representative KEAN, in his many years of service in the House of Representatives, has been a stalwart friend of the Jewish nation and a stalwart supporter of its aspirations. His address is in keeping with his concern for all minority groups, as well as his desire to encourage democratic nations throughout the world.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT W. KEAN BEFORE THE LONG BRANCH, N. J., COMMITTEE FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL, LONG BRANCH, N. J., JUNE 1, 1958

I am indeed pleased to have been asked to meet with you today to celebrate the first 10 years of the State of Israel. I am particularly happy because the record in the past 10 years justifies my confidence, my faith, my support as a Member of Congress of that valiant young nation.

It was over a dozen years ago, knowing of the great interest of so many of my good constituents of Essex County in a solution to the Palestine question, that I felt it my duty to study carefully the problems of that area.

The Library of Congress furnished me with a copy of the Balfour Declaration and other papers on the subject. These documents were studied carefully, for at that time it was being said there had been no promise of an independent Jewish nation but merely a refuge for the Jewish people in Arab Palestine.

After reading and rereading the Balfour Declaration, no other conclusion could have been reached but that an independent nation had been promised.

Further, the Congress of the United States as early as 1924 had gone on record as favoring a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

With these facts in mind, I determined to support publicly the founding of Israel, and have since supported its aspirations as far as was proper for a Member of the United States Congress to do so because it was evident that a strong Israel was in the best interest of the United States.

You all remember the early days, the difficulties which preceded recognition, the threats of partition, and then the support of the United Nations, with immediate recognition of Israel by the United States.

You remember how Israel was invaded by her Arab neighbors the very day after her existence was proclaimed.

You remember how, through the valor and blood of her sons, the little nation drove back her enemies, and thereafter a tenuous peace was established through the armistice.

You remember in October 1948 the Bernadotte plan—a partition which would have ruined future hopes for a strong nation—and the protest by Foster Dulles who was then in Paris as a special aid to the Truman administration.

You remember the protest by Thomas Dewey, then Republican candidate for President, followed up by protests from President Truman.

You remember later on, owing to some retaliatory action against attacks on Israel's borders that the United States withdrew economic support from Israel. The record will show that some of us immediately met in protest with State Department officials and urged restoration of economic aid, which aid was restored a very short time afterward.

You remember the refusal of Egypt to allow Israeli ships to pass peacefully through the Suez Canal; the agreement by the United Nations that Israel was right; and the veto of any action by Russia.

You remember the arms embargo. I protested this in two letters to Secretary Dulles: one dated November 4, 1955, and one January 26, 1956. At that time I wrote that it seemed to me the key to the situation was a realization by the Arab nations that Israel was there to stay. This is still the key, and surely the Arab leaders realize the fact now, but for political reasons will not acknowledge it.

I quote from my public letter to Secretary Dulles at that time:

"I would suggest that consideration be given to a guaranty of the Near Eastern frontiers by all the great powers."

The State Department answered that they did not want Russia involved in the Near East. What a miscalculation. For today, as we know, Russia is in the Near East with both feet.

We must never forget the firm statement made by Secretary Dulles in a letter to me and other Members of Congress written on February 24, 1957, in which he stated: "The preservation of Israel is one of the essential goals of American foreign policy."

The continued harassment of peaceful Israeli villages from the Gaza Strip is fresh in our minds. This finally resulted in the victorious attack on Egypt which again proved the valor and fighting ability of Israel's sons.

We must remember the difficult and peaceful return upon the demand of the United Nations of Israeli troops within her borders. This showed to all the world the strong self-discipline in this difficult and distasteful task.

At last, through the backing of the United States, access to the Red Sea has been achieved with the tremendous future of the pioneer port of Elath.

But troubles continue. It was only a couple of years ago that a British statesman suggested that Israel return to the borders which it had before it was attacked by its neighbors. This seems to be the Arab demand at the moment and unfortunately seems to have the backing of Communist Russia.

Such a thought should be given no consideration as it would partition Israel and hamstring her economy. But the suggestion was quickly slapped down by our administration.

Every American familiar with world events and aware of the Communist danger in the Middle East must be thankful for the existence of Israel. Israel is truly an outpost of democracy in this vital region of the world—not only in the system of its government, in its laws and social order, but also in its background and the spirit of its people.

The Jewish belief in God, in freedom, and human dignity are an anathema to communism and an antidote to Marxian teachings. Jewish individualism is the enemy of the Communist philosophy of subjugating the individual to lose his identity and become a cog to be turned at the will and whim of Communist leadership.

Let us look at some of the accomplishments of the past 10 years:

Israel has trebled her population, thus firmly establishing herself as a haven for those fleeing from persecution.

Through establishment of diplomatic relations with 50 countries she has gained a firm place in the world family of nations.

Israel has steadily expanded her position as a nation of commerce. She has formulated 17 trade agreements. Her exports have increased from $30 million in 1949 to nearly $135 million last year with her goods reaching the markets of 80 nations. Her imports have increased from $250 million to $403 million in the same period.

Israel's industrial economy now represents an investment of more than $700 million. Seventy percent of the capital has come from outside the country, which indicates a firm belief by others in the future of Israel.

Agricultural and mining settlements have sprung up in wastes that had been desolate and uninhabited for centuries. About 500 new agricultural settlements have been established. Cultivated areas have been increased from 195,000 acres to 950,000 acres, while irrigated areas have risen from 63,000 to 275,000 acres.

Israel's system of schools has grown steadily. In 1949, there were 180,844 pupils in elementary schools. Today, the number of pupils is 404,900. There also has been considerable expansion in secondary, vocational, and agricultural education. At the same time, Israel has shown rapid progress in the field of higher education through her universities and she can be proud of her scientific achievements.

Israel is an example of what a virile, valiant people can build in a backward area. A less brave people might have retreated or succumbed in the face of overwhelming odds, yet Israel has moved steadily forward.

She has, of course, aroused jealousies in her neighbors and perhaps fear of the strength that may be developed. The Jewish people have always been freedom loving. They have always fought for liberty.

It was nearly 2,000 years ago that Josephus said of them: "These men have an inviolable attachment to liberty and say that God is their only Lord and Master. They also do not mind dying any death, nor could the fear of death make them call any man their master. This immutable resolution of theirs is well known to a great many. What I have said does not adequately express the determination that they show."

If the Arab world would finally realize that Israel is there to stay, cooperation, however reluctant, would be forthcoming for their own interest. There would be a settlement of the refugee question, of the use of the Suez Canal, of the use of the Jordan waters for irrigation, and permanent peace on its borders would be established.

Then indeed, Israel would no longer have to spend her limited resources on unproductive armaments, but could use the genius of her people to make the Negev desert green and for the future benefit of all her people and all the people of the entire world.

And so, in celebrating this historic anniversary, I join you in saying "Long live Israel."

Delmarva Chicken Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 3, 1958

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I have prepared regarding the 11th annual Delmarva chicken festival.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BEALL

Last week it was my pleasure to attend the 11th annual Delmarva chicken festival as a guest of the Delmarva poultry industry. Mrs. Beall accompanied me to the festival on Maryland's fabulous Eastern Shore, and we had a most enjoyable time.

My good friends and neighbors from Delaware, Senator WILLIAMS and Senator FREAR, attended the festival and Senator WILLIAMS was presented a well-deserved award, an engraved, framed scroll of honor presented annually to the person judged to be Delmarva's distinguished citizen of the year.

I present for the RECORD information about the chicken industry on the Delmarva peninsula and a few highlights of the festival, held this year in Denton, Md., a peaceful little town of 1,800 people on the banks of the Choptank River, which for 3 days was the chicken capital of the world.

The Delmarva Peninsula is a narrow strip of land 200 miles long, situated between the Chesapeake and Delaware Bays. It contains the entire State of Delaware, 9 Eastern Shore counties of Maryland, and 2 counties of Virginia. It has long been known as the place where the broiler industry, as we know it today, got its start.

Many dietitians believe that chicken eventually will make up a fifth of every family's meat purchases. Most of it will be young, tender chicken, the kind Delmarva grows and sells, aptly called Delmarvalous chicken. This would mean every man, woman, and child would be eating an average of 41 pounds of chicken a year instead of 24 pounds, the average today.

Delmarva chicken growers and related industries are shooting for a high goal. They have joined together in an organization known as the Delmarva Poultry Industry, Inc., dedicated to the increasing of the quality of Delmarvalous chickens and the consumption of chicken on dinner tables all over the world. Led by John R. Hargreaves, president, Delmarva Poultry Industry, Inc., and general manager of the Caroline Poultry Farms Co., hundreds of men and women work voluntarily and cheerfully to tell the story of their industry to millions of consumers.

Delmarva growers, processors, and suppliers do a good job. Most Americans probably feel that the automobile industry is the most efficient industry in our land. However, the men who grow and process chickens on the Delmarva Peninsula don't agree. Using the assembly line techniques practiced by the automobile companies, they can put poultry on the dinner table today for only a little more than the housewife paid in 1940, even though the purchasing

power of the dollar, generally speaking, is only half what it was then. Our chicken growers and processors are proud that this is done without subsidy from public funds. And any housewife can tell you that the 1958 poultry package is as much over its 1940 counterpart as are today's autos over those of 17 years ago.

I want to point out a few details of the size of the Delmarva chicken industry and what the industry means to the economic lifeblood and financial well-being of the Delmarva Peninsula. Last year, the infant industry that got its start in farm backyards on the peninsula in the early 1920's grew nearly 180 million chickens. Its total 1957 payroll amounted to almost $45 million; its feed bill was $67 million. Cost of baby chicks totaled $22 million, and the industry paid taxes of over a million and a quarter dollars.

A total of 12,697 people worked directly in some branch of the industry, either on farms, in processing plants, for feed manufacturers, hatcheries, and suppliers. Additional thousands of people worked in by-products plants, ice plants, and other businesses *not* entirely a part of the industry, but supporting and closely related. Delmarva's 5,000 broiler houses, averaging 10,000 birds capacity each, are worth over $60 million, and this does not take into account the value of the fields or the other buildings and homes on the farms. Processing plants on the peninsula are worth about $15 million. No other agricultural business in the world has grown to such giant size in so short a time. Delmarvaland, the birthplace of the broiler industry, has seen its fledgling idea of a generation ago grow into a giant that does more than a billion and a half dollar business a year.

Each year in June, Delmarva Poultry Industry's officers and directors and many of its members team up with the public-spirited leaders of some community on the peninsula to hold the annual Delmarva Chicken Festival. For 3 days this community is the showcase of the mighty chicken industry for all the world to see, either by attending, as more than 20,000 did this year, or by hearing and seeing reports of it in the press and on the radio and television.

Delmarva Poultry Industry joins forces with the Poultry and Egg National Board to hold the national chicken-cooking contest. Dozens of the Nation's leading food editors and home economists attend the festival to discover new recipes—new ways to prepare chicken for their vast audiences.

At the 11th annual festival this year in Denton, Md., an unprecedented number of contestants came from 17 States and 2 foreign countries to compete for the title as "National Chicken Cooking Champion," both junior and senior divisions. A housewife from New York who had never before entered a cooking contest won the title of "National Chicken Cooking Champion" over a field of 186 entries. She was Mrs. Barbara Marks, 32, of Wantagh, Long Island, N. Y. Her entry, chicken tarragon champignon, was judged top dish in a contest which produced what a distinguished panel of judges termed the best cooking and finest recipes ever offered.

It was my privilege to crown the new champion, who, incidentally, was given many valuable prizes. Mrs. Marks prepares her championship dish as follows:

One 3-pound Delmarva chicken, cut into eighths; 4 tablespoons of butter; 1 onion, sliced thin; one-half pound of fresh mushrooms, sliced; 1 tablespoon of tarragon; 1 tablespoon Lowry's seasoned salt; one-half teaspoon fresh ground pepper; dash of paprika.

Season pieces of chicken with Lowry's salt, pepper, and paprika. Melt butter in copper skillet. Brown chicken on both sides. Sprinkle tarragon over the chicken. Put in onions and mushrooms; cover and let simmer until tender, about 25 minutes. Serve from copper skillet. Serves four.

Both the second-place and the third-place winners were from the State of Maryland. Second place went to Mrs. LeRoy B. Edgar, Jr., of Cambridge, Md. Her prizewinning dish was called chicken paella. Here is the recipe:

One 3-pound chicken, cut in serving pieces; 2 tablespoons flour; one-half cup olive oil; 1½ cup onion, chopped; 1 clove garlic, minced; 1 small green pepper, chopped; 1 pound fresh peas, shelled; 4 tomatoes, peeled and sliced; 1 bottle clam juice, 8 ounces; 1½ cups water; one-half teaspoon salt; one-fourth teaspoon pepper; one-eighth teaspoon marjoram; 2 cans (7½ ounces each) minced clams; 1 pound steamed shrimp, shelled and deveined.

Coat chicken pieces with flour; brown in oil in frying pan and place in 12-cup baking dish. Saute rice, onion, garlic, and green pepper in frying pan until rice is golden; spoon over and around chicken in baking dish; top with peas and tomatoes. Heat clam juice, water, salt, pepper, and marjoram in same frying pan and pour over the chicken in baking dish. Cover and bake in moderate oven 350° for 30 minutes; add clams and liquid and shrimps; cover and bake 30 minutes longer.

This recipe will make 8 to 10 servings.

A Maryland boy, only 15 years of age, competing with young women and men from all over the country, won the junior national championship. He is Jimmy Collins Bennett, son of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph C. Bennett, of Salisbury, Md., and his prizewinning dish, done up in an aluminumfoil basket designed in the shape of a rocket, is called Imperial Chicken of Tomorrow. Here's the recipe of our 15-year-old boy:

One 2½- to 3-pound chicken; 2 cups bread crumbs; three-fourths cup of Parmesan or Romano cheese; one-fourth cup of chopped parsley; 1 clove garlic, crushed; 2 teaspoons salt; one-eighth teaspoon pepper; one-half pound butter.

Remove crust from an unsliced loaf of bread. Grate bread crumbs fine enough for 2 cups of crumbs. Spread out on flat pan to dry overnight. When ready to cook, mix crumbs with three-fourths cup of grated cheese, chopped parsley, garlic, salt and pepper. Have frying chicken cut into pieces. Dip each piece into melted butter (about one-half pound) then into crumb mixture. Be sure each piece is well coated. Arrange in shallow pan so they don't overlap. Dot with 2 tablespoons more of butter. Bake 1 hour or until fork tender in moderate oven 350°.

Out of 59 entrants in the junior contest, 7 were boys, and 3 of these were among 12 prizewinners.

Along with thousands of other festival visitors, Mrs. Beall and I were treated to Delmarvalous chicken from the world's largest fry pan, in which about 5,000 chickens were cooked during the festival. Additional thousands of chickens were served at an outdoor barbecue and other food concessions manned by church and civic organizations. We went through the large industry show, a beautiful art exhibit in which many pieces of fine art, of the more than 400 entries, were related to the chicken industry. We visited with beauty queens and talent contest winners. On Saturday, we reviewed one of the best balanced and most impressive parades I have ever seen.

I want to pay tribute to the men and women in Denton and elsewhere throughout the Delmarva Peninsula, led by Festival General Chairman John Asher, assistant manager of the Choptank Electric Cooperative, who had the tremendous job of carrying out the thousands of details necessary for putting across such a festival. Such jobs are done almost entirely by public-spirited citizens "burning the midnight oil." These are the people who are boosting the broiler industry, the very lifeblood of the Delmarva Peninsula.

The Lebanese Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 3, 1958

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the small, mountainous state of Lebanon at the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea lately has come to be a principal focal point in the contemporary world struggle of the two great power systems. The outcome of contest for control of this small republic will have a very important bearing—possibly a decisive one—on efforts of the West, headed by the United States and its immediate allies, to prevent the spread of Communist Russian domination into the strategic Middle Eastern countries whose continued independence of totalitarian control may well be vital to the ultimate survival of the Free World.

Only a few years ago a bitter war was fought in Korea to set limits to the spread of Soviet imperialism in the Far East. Considering the strategic position of the countries of the Middle East to East-West routes of communication, to invaluable deposits of petroleum, and to the peoples and resources of the huge continent of Africa, Lebanon—a keystone of the Middle East—has an importance to the Free World far in excess to that of Korea. The control of Lebanon by forces under Soviet domination would be a disaster of the first magnitude for the West; it might, indeed, prove to be irreparable.

Both because of its situation among the states of the Middle East and because of its peculiar internal composition Lebanon presents a unique challenge to the powers arrayed against each other in the cold war. Its small size—about that of Puerto Rico—and its relatively small population of approximately a million and a half represents a balance of forces so delicate as to make it almost a pawn in world politics. Various Christian sects have held out in this mountainous region since the early Christian era. Intermixed with them since the seventh century have been Moslem Arabs who have given the country its official language and some of its overall Arab character. Added to these elements are groups of Druses, neither Christian nor Moslem but more nearly associated with the latter. Though not numerous, they have been an independent people through many centuries, traditionally opposed, as they are now, to any central government.

World War I, which ended Ottoman control of the area, brought in France

as a mandatory power both in Lebanon and in Syria. Even then the Lebanese contrived to maintain a regime separate, in most respects, from Syria. Since 1946, at the close of World War II, when Lebanon achieved status as an independent state, relations with Syria have tended to deteriorate. Since Syria joined Egypt to form the United Arab Republic in February of this year Lebanon has been in real jeopardy. The United Arab Republic, under the control of Egypt's Nasser, armed and abetted by the Soviet Union, has sought to take advantage of the presence of dissident elements in Lebanon to overthrow the present constitutional regime, headed by President Camille Chamoun, a pro-West Christian, and to replace this administration with one favorable to the Syria-Egypt axis. Very possibly the ultimate aim of this conspiracy is to bring Lebanon by subversive means into the Soviet-oriented United Arab Republic.

For all that Lebanon has had a rather turbulent domestic history since the establishment of the Republic, owing chiefly to the rivalries of the several contrasting cultural elements in the country—some of them admirers of President Nasser, the nation has maintained a fairly consistent foreign policy. It has maintained a neutral attitude toward the Baghdad pact, to be sure, but at the same time it has declined to enter an Arab alliance set up by Egypt with the support of Syria, Saudi Arabia, and Yemen. It has signed commercial treaties with Russia—1954, East Germany—1955, Communist China—1955, and Poland—1956, and its capital city, Beirut, has been a center of activity of Communist agents, yet down to the present time the Lebanese Government has steadfastly displayed an attitude hostile to communism as it did, for example, at the Bandung Conference in April 1955. When, early in last year—1957—Ambassador Richards visited the Middle East in order to allay any apprehension that might have been caused by the newly-formulated Eisenhower doctrine, Lebanon was the only state of the area which went on record as endorsing it officially. This attitude has been reaffirmed on several occasions since with such clarity and emphasis as to suggest that the United States has no better friend than Lebanon in the Arab Middle East. On October 15 last, for example, Dr. Charles Malik, Foreign Minister of Lebanon, stated at a news conference:

Lebanon stands firm in its friendship to and cooperation with the United States. The agreements whereby we receive technical, economic, and military aid from the United States constitute an important aspect of our foreign policy. We certainly intend to remain faithful to these agreements. * * *

The traditional friendship and understanding between Lebanon and the United States is a cornerstone of our foreign policy. While certainly standing always with the Arab World, of which we form an integral part, in any conflict with the West involving legitimate Arab rights and aspirations, yet in the world struggle between totalitarianism and dialectical materialism, on the one hand, and the principles and forces of freedom, on the other hand, Lebanon ranges itself unreservedly on the side of the Free World.

Early in May of the present year various disaffected groups in Lebanon, irked by President Chamoun's reported aim of achieving an amendment to the constitution in the interest of an additional presidential term, and given impulse and arms, apparently, by agents of the United Arab Republic, attacked and burned United States libraries in Tripoli and Beirut, blew up an Iraq Petroleum Co.'s pipeline, and inaugurated a regime of violence that has approached the dimensions of a civil war. From an original demand for President Chamoun's resignation, the rebel elements have proceeded to strive for the overthrow of the entire governmental administration with the apparent aim of setting up a pro-Nasser government and achieving a complete change of orientation in foreign policy.

Uncertain of the temper of its minuscule army and unwilling to provoke a full-fledged civil war, the Lebanese Government has restricted its retaliatory measures largely to police action. On May 13 it dispatched a note of protest to the Government of the United Arab Republic protesting against massive interference by that state in the affairs of Lebanon. At the same time it expressed a possible interest in receiving assistance from Western powers, under some feature of formalized policy for the Middle East, such as the Tripartite Declaration of 1950. As the rebellion gained momentum, clearly with the aid of arms and volunteer units from Syria, the United States began the shipment of police equipment to that country under a mutual security arrangement of 1956 and placed the Sixth Fleet on a ready basis.

On May 15, at the close of President Nasser's 18-day visit to the Soviet Union, Premier Khrushchev pledged all necessary help to the United Arab Republic. "We have all the means to give you disinterested and fraternal help," he said, indicating that "we want your country to grow stronger." This was followed a few days later by a Soviet warning to the West against interfering in the Lebanese crisis.

The United States meanwhile gave consideration to its international obligations and to principles of policy under which it might give other than arms aid to the beleaguered country. Secretary of State Dulles, stating that Soviet threats would not deter the United States from doing what it considered right anywhere in the world, remarked significantly at a news conference that the Eisenhower doctrine had stated that the independence of Middle Eastern countries was vital to peace and the national interest of the United States. He indicated the readiness of this country to put military forces ashore in Lebanon under two conditions: First, that the Lebanese Government asks for such action with a view to the protection of American citizens in that country; and second that the Lebanese Government take its charge of massive interference of the United Arab Republic to the United Nations Security Council.

While the situation of the Lebanese Government continued to worsen, charges of interference against the United Arab Republic were presented both to the Council of the Arab League, meeting in Benghazi, and to the United Nations. No useful result was achieved at Benghazi. On June 11 the United Nations Security Council moved to send a team of observers to Lebanon to check the smuggling of arms or rebel reinforcements into that country. The observer team was small, however, and little result from its presence could be discerned.

In these circumstances, while no formal request was filed with the United Nations, President Chamoun—on June 26 and again on June 30—indicated that Lebanon might soon ask for a police force to be set up under United Nations auspices.

We hope that we could solve this by ourselves—

He said in a radio interview—

but if we cannot, then we can either go to the U. N. and ask for a U. N. police force or make use of article 51 of the U. N. Charter which allows us in self-defense to appeal for collective defense. Any friendly forces then could come here and take part with the official forces of this country.

On June 17 Secretary of State Dulles again pledged that the United States was prepared to use troops, if necessary, on request of the United Nations to help Lebanon preserve its independence. He added, however, that military action might be undertaken also under "other possible contingencies." This position was immediately attacked from several quarters.

First. The head of the Arab Information Center in Washington, Dr. Hussein Kamel Selim, stated that in such circumstances the Arab League would ask the United Nations to brand the United States as an aggressor.

Second. Dag Hammarskjold, United Nations Secretary General, objected to the landing of an American or Anglo-American expeditionary force in Lebanon, insisting that the U. N. force of 100 observers were doing an adequate job.

Third. Members of the United States Senate also expressed critical attitudes with respect to Secretary Dulles' statements.

At this juncture, when a call for United States and British aid appeared likely to be made at any moment, President Nasser of the United Arab Republic, denying that his state was giving aid in men and arms to the Lebanese rebels, definitely refused to exercise any restraining influence on the Lebanese rebel elements. The Soviet Union also issued a new blast:

Foreign armed intervention in Lebanon would constitute a challenge not only to the peoples of the Arab East who are defending their independence but also to the forces of peace the world over. * * *

The Soviet Union cannot remain indifferent to the preparation of a foreign intervention in Lebanon however it may be disguised. * * *

Official Soviet circles consider that the attempts of certain states to carry out under this or that pretext, an armed intervention in Lebanon are in glaring contradiction to the principles of the U. N. and constitute a mockery of these principles. * * *

Attempts at armed intervention by the Western Powers would inevitably lead to a grave exacerbation of the situation and would gravely jeopardize the cause of peace.

From this point, both the United States and Great Britain, although committed to answer a call for help from Lebanon under existing circumstances, proceeded to urge the Lebanese Government to do its utmost to avoid making such a call. The British were apprehensive of another Suez and were concerned also over the probability of the use of United Arab Republic volunteers in numbers should an Anglo-American expeditionary force, already poised at Cyprus or attached to the 6th Fleet, actually land in Lebanon. As the month of June drew to a close, the outlook for the salvation of Lebanon as an independent state was very dismal, indeed.

The stakes involved in the Lebanese issue are considerably greater than appear superficially. For the most part, they have not been brought clearly to the knowledge of the American people. At this juncture, the United States, having temporized while originally local disturbances in Lebanon developed into an international contest, now is faced with alternatives—all of which are unfortunate. The principal issues involved, briefly, are the following:

First. The impression is very widespread that, upon request by the Lebanese Government and under the conditions outlined by the Secretary of State—conditions that have substantially been met—the United States has committed itself to supplying physical aid to the Lebanese Government in its effort to maintain its integrity. Within the past fortnight indications have appeared that the United States—together with Great Britain—has expressed a wish to be released from this obligation and that, indeed, there would be extreme reluctance to supply military aid at all. Arguments have appeared in United States newspapers to the effect that—

A sound military and political basis for national intervention in Lebanon does not appear to exist. If the Lebanese Government could show that the principal or only threat to its security was from beyond its frontiers and that it had done its best and exerted its fullest power to put down a rebellion, a justification for United States and British intervention could be established. But the circumstances of the fighting show rather clearly that it will be difficult for Beirut to establish such a justification. (Hanson W. Baldwin in the New York Times, June 26, 1958.)

This argument, however, does not cover the whole ground. In the first place, as has been noted, the United States Government has gone on record as viewing as vital the independence of the states of the Middle East. Presumably this would apply most fully to states committed to a close association with this country, particularly when the loss of independence would mean absorption by a political entity decidely under Soviet influence.

In the second place, if the Western allies fail to respond to a call for help in a moment of extremity, whatever prestige the United States and Britain still enjoy in the world would be gravely compromised. Our pledges everywhere in the world would be discounted. Other presently friendly states in the Middle East—Iraq and Jordan and perhaps Turkey—an anchor of the NATO alliance—and Iran with its vast oil resources—could only feel abandoned. In a word, the entire Middle East would have been surrendered to "Nasserism" and indirectly to Soviet influence without a struggle. The Soviet Union itself would have won a major victory without cost.

Second. In such an event, a first consequence would be the maintenance only on suffrage of the Western line of communications through the Mediterranean to the East. There could be no assurance that the line would not be cut at any time when the Soviet Union wished to apply pressure either to the states of Western Europe or to the United States.

Third. Not only would the Baghdad Pact be nullified and the entire "northern tier" barrier be erased, but the entire principle of containment would have jettisoned. The value of NATO itself would have to be reappraised.

Fourth. The entire Arab bloc from Libya in the west to the Persian Gulf in the east would immediately come under the domination of Egypt. It is extremely doubtful that Sudan and Ethiopia, under such circumstances, could avoid falling under the influence of Cario. Even now Sudan is hesitant about undertaking the risk of accepting American aid.

Fifth. Clearly, there could no longer be unimpeded access to Middle East oil. The United Arab Republic and its Soviet sponsor could, at leisure, determine what quantities might be produced in the Arab States and what disposition should be made of these amounts. Iran alone, if it chose still to maintain a Western orientation, could not supply the European States with the petroleum and petroleum products now required by their industrial establishments. Iranian oil supplies would be further reduced if they could be transported to the West only around the continent of Africa.

The situation in Lebanon may appear superficially to be local and relatively petty. To enable a Lebanese President to retain his post until the expiration of his term on September 23 may appear not to be worth the risks obviously involved in landing troops on Lebanese soil. The entire State of Lebanon is minuscule and its present troubles in considerable measure are due to domestic upheavals. Direct intervention without the express sanction of the United Nations brings to the fore some of the same issues that were involved in the application of force by Great Britain and France in the Suez crisis. These matters will need to be weighed carefully on the scales of history. Nevertheless, the hazards of withdrawal or even of continued inaction in the face of the mortal danger of the regularly ordained government of a friendly state—a state so strategically situated in so many important respects—also should be most carefully considered. For the upshot of failure to act vigorously and positively in accordance with advertised United States policy and solemn pledges given thereunder might well be the beginning of complete isolation of the United States and its allies not only from the Middle East but also from the new nations arising elsewhere in Asia and in Africa and the eventual loss of the cold war with all of its attendant sacrifices.

Mineral Exploration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 3, 1958

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement I had prepared in connection with the mineral exploration bill which was passed yesterday.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

This bill is to encourage exploration for minerals of great importance to the future economic welfare of the United States. We are going to face a situation in the near future in which we cannot always be confident of adequate supplies of vital minerals. Our high-grade ores in many areas are playing out and we are forced to mine our ores of lower grades. With the population of the United States growing rapidly, our needs will increase in tremendous proportions.

This bill will provide financial assistance in the form of loans to those who are doing the prospecting and exploration work for these minerals. Private industry is doing considerable work along these lines but the amount is not keeping pace with the rapid depletion of our reserves. This bill will continue a program by which the Federal Government will share part of the burden for exploration in the first instance but will repay both in terms of royalties on production and in increased taxes paid on income.

Private industry has shown considerable interest in this program and current interest remains high. The program is particularly beneficial to small businesses that are unable to obtain sufficient capital to undertake the necessary explorations. These small businesses often are interested in highly strategic minerals that are found only in small quantities in the United States and are not therefore of much interest to larger companies.

We may not always be able to depend on mineral resources from abroad, owing to international tensions and conflict. This measure will assist us in providing the reserves necessary to prepare against such a day.